Remarks

The Abstract has been amended to conform with the requirements of the Examiner.

The specification and drawing have been amended in order to overcome the Examiner's objections.

Claim 21 has been amended to recite the IEEE 802.11 standard, as set forth on page 9, lines 8 and 9, of the instant specification. The Applicants submit that the Examiner's objection to Claim 21 is thereby overcome.

Claim 13 has been amended to delete the language to which the Examiner has objected.

The Examiner is requested to reconsider his objection to Claims 12-26 as being set out in such a generalized manner as to be difficult to determine the meets and bounds of the claims. The Applicants submit that Claims 12 to 26 meet all of the requirements of 35 USC 112, and therefore have the definiteness required by the Statute.

Claims 12 to 22 have been rejected under 35 USC 102 (e) as anticipated by US publication 2002/0071449 to Ho et al. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider this rejection. Nowhere do Ho et al. show or suggest:

"computing a time duration"

as specifically set forth in Claim 12. Furthermore nowhere does Ho et al. show or suggest:

"the time duration is used to control a counter",

as specifically set forth in Claim 12. Rather, Ho et al. teaches a fixed contention-free period, as explained on page 7, paragraph 0074, and shown in Figure 4. It is therefore clear that Ho et al does not affect the patentability of Claim 12.

Similarly nowhere does Ho et al. show or suggest:

"controlling a network allocation counter in response to the computed duration",

as specifically recited in Claim 13. It is therefore clear that Ho et al. does not affect the patentability of Claim 13.

Similarly nowhere does Ho et al show or suggest:

"means for computing a duration for transmission of a plurality of broadcast/multicast frames, the duration controlling a network allocation counter in a plurality of devices associated with a wireless network",

as specifically recited in Claim 15. It is therefore clear that Ho et al. does not affect the patentability of Claim 15.

Similarly nowhere does Ho et al. show or suggest:

"a network allocation counter; a means for receiving duration for transmission of a plurality of broadcast/multi-cast frames of a video frame transmission for downlinking an uninterrupted plurality of broadcast/multicast frames; and means for controlling the network allocation counter in response to the duration",

as specifically recited in Claim 16. It is therefore clear that Ho et al. does not affect the patentability of Claim 16.

Similarly, nowhere does Ho et al show or suggest:

"a node that retains control of a medium by fixing a duration field",

as specifically recited in Claim 18. It is therefore clear that Ho et al does not affect the patentability of Claim 18.

Similarly nowhere does Ho et al show or suggest:

"using interframe spaces of sufficient duration such that a single duration during a session delivers the broadcast/multicast information in a single communication stream eliminating the requirement for contending for the medium for each broadcast/multi-cast frame transmission",

as specifically set forth in Claim 22. It is therefore clear that Ho et al. do not affect the patentability of Claim 22.

Similarly, nowhere does Ho et al. show or suggest:

"said computed duration controls a counter and a plurality of devices associated with a wireless network",

as specifically recited in Claim 23. It is therefore clear that Ho et al. does not affect the patentability of Claim 23.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 23 to 26 under 35 USC 103 (a) as unpatentable over Ho et al. in view of US publication 2002/0163933 to Benveniste. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider this rejection. Benveniste has a fixed contention free period 116, as shown in Figures 2B, 2C, 2G and 2I, and a fixed contention free period 716, as shown in Figure 7B. it is therefore clear that even if the structure of Benveniste were to be combined with the structure of Ho et al, the instant invention would not be obtained.

Claim 14 is dependent from Claim 12 and adds further advantageous features. The Applicants submit that Claim 14 is patentable as its parent Claim 12.

Claim 17 is dependent from Claim 16 and adds further advantageous features. The Applicants submit that Claim 17 is patentable as its parent Claim 16.

CUSTOMER NO: 24498

PU030014

Claims 19 to 21 are dependent from claim 18 and add further advantageous features. The Applicants submit that these subclaims are patentable as their parent Claim 18.

Claims 24 to 26 are dependent from Claim 23 and add further advantageous features. The Applicants submit that these subclaims are patentable as their parent Claim 23.

The Applicants have reviewed the art which has been cited but not relied upon. The Applicants submit that such art is no more pertinent to the claimed invention than the art which has been relied upon.

The Applicants submit that the instant application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

No fee is believed to have been incurred by virtue of this amendment. However if a fee is incurred on the basis of this amendment, please charge such fee against deposit account 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,
Guillaume Bichot
Shaily Verma

by Daniel E. Sragow
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 22,856
609/734-6832

THOMSON Licensing LLC
Patent Operation
PO Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

Date: 18 July '08